



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/811,971	03/19/2001	Arvind D. Gidwani	CIS00-3846	9268

7590

05/27/2004

Barry W. Chapin, Esq.
CHAPIN & HUANG, L.L.C
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive
Westborough, MA 01581

EXAMINER

AKERS, GEOFFREY R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3625

DATE MAILED: 05/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/8/1971

Applicant(s)

Gidussi

Examiner

Akers, g

Art Unit

3625

ML

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3/19/01
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election require

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 2 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Hanzek(US Pat. No: 6,654,726) in view of Payne(US Pat. No: 6,449,599).

2. As per claim 1 Hanzek teaches in an order server a method for processing order messages comprising the steps of

receiving a first message of the order message over a network where the first message comprising a first file organized in a first predefined format of the first document in response to the step of receiving the first message(col 6 lines 9-13)

obtaining a second data set by processing the first data set of the first message in response to the step of obtaining the first data set(Fig 7B/602)(col 11 lines 6-25) and

providing over the network the second data set in a second message comprising a second file organized in a second predefined format suitable for use by an ordering application(col 10 lines 31-50)(Fig 4B/448).Hanzek does not specifically teach a document processing. Payne does this(Fig 2A/24/26/30/28)(Fig 2C/44)(Fig 2I/102/104)(Fig 4B/152)(col 5 lines 20-50)(col 6 line 64-col 7 line 6)(col 6 lines 13-18).It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine Hanzek in view of Payne to teach the claim. The motivation to combine is to teach a network payment system that includes buyer and vendor computers for buying products and a payment computer for processing payment messages as enunciated by Payne(col 3 lines 42-48).

Art Unit: 3625

3. As per claim 2 Hanzek teaches according to the method of claim 1 wherein the order server is a vendor order server and the ordering application is a customer ordering application and wherein

the step of receiving the first message comprises receiving a first extended markup language document from the customer ordering application(col 14 lines 33-38)(Fig 9)

the step of obtaining the first data set comprises obtaining the first data set from a first predefined element of the first extended markup language document(Fig 10/922) and the step of obtaining the second data set comprises invoking an ordering function based on a message type defined in a second predefined element of the first extended markup language document to generate the second data set(col 15 lines 19-31)(col 15 line 49-col 16 line 40) and the step of providing the second data set comprises providing the second data set in a third predefined element in a second extended markup language document to the customer ordering application(col 16 line 41-col 17 line 40).

4. As per claim 3 Hanzek teaches according to the method of claim 1 wherein the step of receiving the first message comprises directing the first message to a first message processing module of a plurality of message processing modules(Fig 2/112/114/116/118/119)(Fig 9/906)(col 15 line 1-24).

5. As per claim 4 Hanzek teaches the method of claim 3 wherein the step of directing the first message comprises parsing the first message to determine a message type that identifies an ordering function for the first message and directing the first message to the first processing module based on the message type(col 14 line 46-col 15 line 5)(Fig 9/904).

6. As per claim 5 Hanzek teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the step of obtaining the second data set comprises interacting with an order database based on the first data set and based on a message type of the first message to generate the second data set(col 14 lines 15-32).

7. As per claim 6 Hanzek teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the step of obtaining the second data set comprises performing an ordering function based on the first data set and based on a message type of the first message to generate the second data set(col 18 line 6-30)(Fig 14A/1062/1061).

8. As per claim 7 Hanzek teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the second predefined format is suitable for integration into a database maintained by the ordering application(col 18 line 31-col 19 line 6)(Fig 17)(Fig 18).

9. As per claim 8 Hanzek teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the first document and the second document are extended mark-up language documents(Fig 10)(Fig 9)(col 7 line 46-col 8 line 5)(col 12 lines 54-60)(col 16 line 4-col 17 line 31).

10. As per claim 9 Hanzek teaches an order server(Fig 2/110) for processing order messages wherein the order server comprises a memory an input/output interface(Fig 2/120/122) in communication with the memory and a processor in communication with the memory and the input/output interface wherein the memory is encoded with logic instructions for an order message manager application that when performed on the processor(Fig 6/352) causes the processor to form an order message manager that processes order messages by performing the operations of

receiving through the I/O interface a first message of the order message over a network the first message comprising a first document organized in a first predefined format(col 6 lines 39-44)

obtaining a first data set from the first message based on the first predefined format of the first document in response to the step of receiving the first message(col 7 line 46-col 8 line 24)

obtaining a second data set by processing the first data set of the first message in response to the step of obtaining the first data set(Fig 7B/602)(col 11 lines 6-25) and providing through the input/output interface over the network the second data set in a second message comprising a second document organized in a second predefined format suitable for use by an ordering application(col 10 lines 31-50)(Fig 4B/448). Hanzek does not specifically teach document processing. Payne does this(Fig 2A/24/26/30/28)(Fig 2C/44)(Fig 2I/102/104)(Fig 4B/152)(col 5 lines 20-50)(col 6 line 64-col 7 line 6)(col 6 lines 13-18).It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine Hanzek in view of Payne to teach the claim. The motivation to combine is to teach a network payment system that includes buyer and vendor computers for buying products and a payment computer for processing payment messages as enunciated by Payne(col 3 lines 42-48).

11. As per claim 10 Hanzek teaches the order server of claim 9 wherein the order server is a vendor order server and the ordering application is a customer ordering application and wherein the logic instructions for the order message manager application comprise further logic instructions that when performed on the processor cause the order message manager to perform the operations of receiving a first extended markup language document for the customer ordering application and obtaining the first data set from a first predefined element of the first extended markup language document(Fig 10/922) and invoking an ordering function based on a message type defined in a second predefined element of the first extended markup language

Art Unit: 3625

document to generate the second data set(col 15 lines 19-31)(col 15 line 49-col 16 line 40) and providing the second data set in a third predefined element in a second extended markup language document to the customer ordering application(col 16 line 41-col 17 line 40).

12 . As per claim 11 Hanzek teaches the order server of claim 9 wherein the logic instructions for the order message manager application comprise further logic instructions that when performed on the processor cause the order message manager to perform the operation of directing the first message to a first message processing module of a plurality of message processing modules(Fig 2/112/114/116/118/119)(Fig 9/908)(col 15 lines 1-24).

13. As per claim 12 Hanzek teaches the order server of claim 11 wherein the logic instructions for the order message manager application comprise further logic instructions. that when performed on the processor cause the order message manager to perform the operation of parsing the first message to determine a message type that identifies an ordering function for the first message and directing the first message to the first processing module based on the message type(col 14 line 46-col 15 line 5)(Fig 9/904).

14. As per claim 13 Hanzek teaches the order server of claim 9 wherein the logic instructions for the order message manager application comprise further logic instruction that when performed on the processor cause the order message manager to perform the operation of interacting with an order database based on the first data set and based on a message type of the first message type of the first message to generate the second data set(col 14 lines 15-32).

Art Unit: 3625

15. As per claim 14 Hanzek teaches the order server of claim 9 wherein the logic instructions for the order message manager application comprise further logic instructions that when performed on the processor cause the order message manager to perform the operation of performing an ordering function based on the first data set and based on a message type of the first message to generate the second data set(col 18 lines 6-30)(Fig 14A/1062/1061).

16. As per claim 15 Hanzek teaches the order server of claim 9 wherein the second predefined format is suitable for integration into a database maintained by the ordering application(col 18 line 31-col 19 line 6)(Fig 17)(Fig 18).

17. As per claim 16 Hanzek teaches the order server of claim 9. wherein the first document and the second document are extended markup language documents(Fig 10)(Fig 9)(col 7 line 46-col 8 line 5)(col 12 lines 54-60)(col 16 line 4-col 17 line 31).

18. As per claim 17 Hanzek teaches a computer program product that includes a computer readable medium having instructions stored thereon for processing, order messages such that the instructions when carried out by a computer cause the computer to perform the steps of receiving the first message of the order messages over a network the first message comprising a first document organized in a first predetermined format and obtaining a first data set from the first message based on the predefined format of the first document in response to the step of receiving the first message(col 6 lines 9-13)

obtaining a second data set by processing the first data set the first message in response to the step of obtaining the first data set(Fig 7B/602)(col 11 lines 6-25) and providing over the network the second data set in a second message comprising a second document organized in a second predefined format suitable for use by an ordering application(col 10 lines 31-50). Hanzek does not

specifically teach a document processing. Payne does this(Fig 2A/24/26/30/28)(Fig 2C/44)(Fig 2I/102/104)(Fig 4B/152)(col 5 lines 20-50)(col 6 line 64-col 7 line 6)(col 6 lines 13-18).It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine Hanzek in view of Payne to teach the claim. The motivation to combine is to teach a network payment system that includes buyer and vendor computers for buying products and a payment computer for processing payment messages as enunciated by Payne(col 3 lines 42-48).

19. As per claim 18 Hanzek teaches an order server(Fig 2/110) for processing order messages the order server comprising means for receiving a first message of the order messages over a network the first message comprising a first document organized in a first predefined format with means for obtaining a first data set for the first message based on the first predefined format of the first document in response to the step of receiving the first message(col 7 line 46-col 8 line 24) with means for obtaining a second data set by processing the first data set of the first message in response to the step of obtaining the first data set(Fig 7B/602)(col 11 lines 6-25) with means for providing over the network the second data set in a second message comprising a second document organized in a second predefined format suitable for use by an ordering application(col 10 lines 31-50)(Fig 4B/448). Hanzek does not specifically teach a document processing. Payne does this(Fig 2A/24/26/30/28)(Fig 2C/44)(Fig 2I/102/104)(Fig 4B/152)(col 5 lines 20-50)(col 6 line 64-col 7 line 6)(col 6 lines 13-18).It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine Hanzek in view of Payne to teach the claim. The motivation to combine is to teach a network payment system that includes buyer and vendor computers for buying products and a payment computer for processing payment messages as enunciated by Payne(col 3 lines 42-48).

Art Unit: 3625

20. Claim 17 is also rejected under 35 USC 101 for failing to define a concrete, useful and tangible output.

Conclusion

21. **THIS ACTION IS MADE NON-FINAL.**

22. Any questions concerning this communication should be addressed to the primary examiner of record, Dr. Geoffrey Akers, P.E., who can be reached between 6:30 AM and 5:00 PM Monday through Friday at 703-306-5844. If attempts to contact the primary examiner are unsuccessful, the primary examiner's superior, Mr. Vincent Millin, SPE, may be telephoned at (703)-308-1065.

GRA

May 22, 2004



DR. GEOFFREY R. AKERS, P.E.
PRIMARY EXAMINER